

"No written or oral agreements have been made between the Daily Publishing Company, Inc., and the Rundschau, Delta Verlag AG, or the Agence France-Monde. Further answer to No. 12 on rider attached hereto marked 'A'."

Q. Will you read the answer in the rider? A. The rider is an insert, but it is under "A."

"12 (continued): We send to the Rundschau, Delta 14389 Verlag AG and Agence France-Monde, or direct to the newspapers receiving their service, news concerning current events in the United States and we receive from both Rundschau, Delta Verlag AG and the Agence France-Monde news of events in Europe.

"We receive these news services as a contribution given by Mr. Earl Browder, who is General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Mr. Browder informs us that he arranged the service by agreement made in April 1936 with Mr. Julius Alperi, care of France-Monde, Paris, France, whereby the accounts for this service would be offset by (a) contributions to the news and press articles sent from the United States to Europe, to offices of newspapers designated by the Rundschau, Delta Verlag AG and Agence France-Monde, and (b) payment of account balances periodically to an agency of the Rundschau, Delta Verlag AG or of the Agence France-Monde, by means of publication rights abroad of the writings of Mr. Browder, William Z. Foster and others. This arrangement was established before the Daily Publishing Company, Inc., came into existence, and was continued by it as a matter of routine."

That, however, was a device used in order to escape the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Q. But they did register under that Act? A. They 14390 registered in order to say they had no foreign principal.

14530

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. PAISLEY:

14542 Q. With reference to this news service about which — you testified and about which you were cross-examined, as I understand it both the State Department and the Justice Department were communicating with both Browder and Mrs. Granich during the period from this arrangement which was made by Mr. Browder right up through 1944 in an effort to get them to register as foreign agents, is that correct?

14543 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

Q. How frequently did you discuss the matter of this effort of the State Department and the Justice Department to have these people register as foreign agents, as agents of a foreign principal? How frequently?

14544 THE WITNESS: I had frequent discussions of the matter, particularly with Mrs. Granich, who came over to my office almost once a week to discuss the matter, not that frequently, maybe twice a month, and then as 1942 to 1944 came about, that is, after it, I had a number of discussions with her some of which were quite close together, because at that time she contended that the Department of Justice was pressing very hard in regard to the necessity of labelling this material as propaganda. That was becoming more and more the insistence of the Department of Justice during that two-year period.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Do you remember now approximately when the Department of Justice finally ruled and so informed her that this material must be labeled?

THE WITNESS: It was around 1944, the early part of 1944.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Up to that time had there been any change or diminution whatsoever in the receipt of this news from Moscow?

14545 THE WITNESS: No. It came in in approximately the same volume. Of course just as at the time of Runag, there were periods when it was more intense, but it was approximately the same thing, translations of Soviet publications and other information from throughout the world gathered through Moscow.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. In other words, did the pressure from the State Department and the Justice Department cause any change whatsoever in the transmission of this information to you?

14546 THE WITNESS: Not in the contents of the material up until about May 1944, when Intercontinent News was discontinued. During the time between Runag and Intercontinent News there was the same transmission of news except it came through Intercontinent News, and then in May 1944 Intercontinent News had to suspend.

MR. PAISLEY: These next two documents, Mr. Chairman, if received in evidence, are rather short and could be read into the record. I don't have photostats. They are originals so I don't want them marked. I want to show them now to the witness and see if he can identify them.

MR. BROWN: Very well.

MR. PAISLEY: If he does I would like the privilege of reading them into the record.

MR. BROWN: Show them to the witness, if you will, for identification, and then to Respondent's counsel.

(Respondent's counsel examining documents)

MR. ABT: No objection.

MR. MARCANTONIO: No objection, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWN: Very well.

MR. ABT: To save time, Mr. Paisley, we concede 14547 authenticity.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Are you familiar with Grace Granich stationery? A. Yes, I saw this letter.

Q. Did you also see this notice sent out? A. Not only did I see it but it was given to me as a sample of what they were sending out.

MR. MABCANTONIO: We are not questioning the authenticity of that and we are not objecting to its going in.

MR. PAISLEY: I understand that. I am a little obstinate myself once in a while. I wanted the witness to identify it.

This letter is on the stationery of Intercontinent News, 207 Fourth Avenue, Room 902, New York City. Grace Granich, editor, cable address INCONTNEWS. American representative: Universal Press Service, Moscow, USSR. Dated May 16, 1944. Addressed to Mr. James R. Sharp, Chief, Foreign Agents Registration Section, War Division, Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C.:

"Dear Mr. Sharp:

"Enclosed herewith is a copy of a communication which I have sent today to all my subscribers.

"Until it is definitely ascertained whether the new ruling of the Attorney General applies to me, and I have 14548 obtained legal advice as to further procedure, I am issuing no more bulletins, nor disseminating in any way the cabled news service which I received from Universal Press Service in the USSR.

"In this connection I repeat again my conviction that the law in question should not apply to me since I represent a bonafide news agency in an allied country, which agency is not owned or controlled by either a foreign government or a foreign political party. As I told you when we discussed the matter in Washington in January of last year, I considered the application of this law to an agent of an unofficial news agency in the Soviet Union a discrimination against the Soviet Union, since the act specifically excludes from its pro-



visions news agencies, privately owned, in friendly or allied countries.

"Yours very truly, Grace Granich, Editor, Inter-Continent News."

"Copy of Notice to subscribers."

Those words are typed at the bottom of the first page.

The enclosure is a mimeographed letter signed Editor, Intercontinent News, dated May 16, 1944, addressed "To All Subscribers."

"We regret to inform you that on May 15, 1944, 14549 we temporarily discontinued the news service supplied by this agency.

"We have been compelled to take this step because of a ruling of the Attorney General of the United States, which demands that the news supplied by Universal Press Service, Moscow, and distributed to you by this agency be labelled 'political propaganda.'

"Since we are unwilling to label the news received from the USSR as 'propaganda'—which it is not—and since we are seeking legal opinion in this matter, we have no other recourse but to discontinue our service, until such time as the situation may be clarified.

"If your failure to receive the service supplied by Intercontinent News works a hardship upon you, we can only refer you to the Department of Justice.

"Very truly yours, Editor, Intercontinent News."

At this time I ask the Board to take judicial notice of the provision of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, which, as I understand, makes a matter of public record all these registration statements that were filed with the Justice Department. I say that because we were accused here the other day of suppressing evidence. These documents that they put in evidence were matters of public record available to each side, and I hardly see how we can be justly 14550 accused of holding and secreting evidence.

. . . . .

MR. BROWN: Do you want to refer to certain specific sections of that act?

MR. ABT: We submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Panel can take judicial notice of the entire Foreign Agents Registration Act.

MR. BROWN: Very well. There being no objection, the Panel will do so. Let's proceed.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. After that date you ceased to get this news service from Intercontinent News? A. It ceased completely.

14660 John Gates called as a witness on behalf of Respondent having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

14662 Q. Do you hold any offices in the Communist Party at the present time? A. Yes.

Q. What office do you hold? A. I am a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party.

Q. When did you first become a member of the National Committee? A. Of the Communist Party?

Q. Yes. A. In July of 1945.

Q. Will you state the circumstances under which you were made a member of the Committee? A. Well, there was a Special Emergency Convention of the Communist Party at that time. I was not present at the Convention, I was a member of the United States Armed Forces. I was in Germany at the time. I was elected by that Convention to the National Committee in absentia.

Q. Had you, prior to that time, been a member of the National Committee of the Communist Political Association? A. Yes. At the Convention of the Communist Political Association in 1944, I was elected to the National Council of that organization, also in ab-

sentia. At that time, I was in the Aleutian Islands in the United States Armed Forces.

Q. When did you take office as a member of the National Committee? A. When I returned from the Army, in, roughly, February, 1946.

Q. Have you been a member of the National Committee continuously since that time? A. Yes.

Q. You were re-elected? A. I was re-elected in the National Convention of 1948, and again elected in the Convention of 1950.

14720 Q. Prior to your departure to Spain, did you make an application for a passport? A. I did.

Q. Under what name? A. Under the name that was on my birth certificate, Isriel Ragenstrich.

Q. The name on your birth certificate? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the application call for a listing by you of the countries to be visited? A. It did.

Q. Did you list Spain as one of the countries to be visited by you? A. I did not.

Q. Why not? A. Because at that time the Government of the United States of America did not permit anyone to use a passport for traveling to Spain, although it did permit passports for traveling to Fascist Germany and  
14721 Italy.

Q. On your arrival in Spain, did you serve with the International Brigade? A. I did.

14759 Q. Now, what are the objectives of the Communist Party? A. Well, we divide the objectives of the Communist Party into two parts, the immediate and ultimate objectives of the Communist Party.

Q. What do you and your associates mean by the terms ultimate and immediate objectives? What is the ultimate objective?

First, what is the immediate objective? A. The immediate objectives of the Communist Party—



Q. Just a moment. Before you give us the meaning of the ultimate and immediate objectives, will you first tell us what is the difference between the two?

MR. PAISLEY: You mean as far as the Communist interpretation as applied to the United States?

14760 MR. MARCANTONIO: That is right, of the United States.

THE WITNESS: By immediate objectives, we mean all of those interests of the American people arising out of the every-day effects of the operation of the capitalist system on their struggle for existence to make both ends meet, from the economic point of view, all of those issues arising out of the improvement of their democratic rights, preservation and extension of those rights, and the peace of the American people and the world.

Generally, these immediate objectives have to do with those issues that can be solved within the framework of the capitalist system, that is, they can be won, they can be achieved.

The ultimate objectives refer to the cause of these evils, the operations of the capitalist system, and have to do with those measures that bring about a final solution, a radical solution, a solution that strikes at the roots of the evil of the capitalist system. That is, a revolutionary change. That is the ultimate objective.

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. Now, what do you mean by a revolutionary change?

A. By a revolutionary change I mean the superseding of the capitalist system, which is a system of the ownership of the mines, mills, factories, means of communications, by a few capitalists and operated for profit on the basis of the exploitation of the many; the superseding of this system by a socialist system, namely a system in which these means of production, that is, the factories, mines, mills and so on, pass over into public ownership from private ownership, and are operated under a government of the majority of the people led by the work-



ing class, and in which the goods that are produced by the mills and factories and so on under this public ownership are produced for use and not for the profit of any few individuals. And a system in which, therefore, the exploitation of man by man is limited.

Q. Now, what do you say, then, is the ultimate objective of the Communist Party of the United States? A. The attainment of socialism in the United States.

Q. And socialism is what you have defined here a moment ago. A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, specifically what are the immediate objectives of the Communist Party of the United States? A. Well, as I said, they fall into the categories of promotion of the economic interests and welfare of the American people, the preservation and extension of the democratic rights and liberties of the country which specifically also deal especially with the problems of the Negro people of the United States, and lastly all those questions having to do with the peace of the nation.

14762 Q. Now, what means does the Communist Party of the United States of America advocate to achieve these objectives, both immediate and ultimate? A. Peaceful and constitutional means.

Q. Just exactly what does the Communist Party mean when it says by peaceful and constitutional means? A. It means the exercise of the constitutional rights of the American people, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of views, freedom of the press, to place our views before the American people on all of the matters that modern industry has created in order to do that, within these constitutional safeguards.

Q. Are these objectives of the Communist Party stated in any official document of the Party? A. Yes, they are stated in many official documents of the Party. They are first of all stated in the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States, and they have always

14763 been stated in the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States. They have also been stated very often in the main resolutions adopted by various conventions, national conventions, of the Communist Party, national committee meetings, meetings of all types, resolutions, main speeches made by leaders of the Communist Party and so on. Throughout our literature of the Communist Party of the United States, these things are stated.

Q. And you say these things are stated in the constitution? A. Yes, that is the basic document of the program.

Q. That constitution is distributed widely among the membership? A. Yes, it is distributed widely among the membership and it is also distributed to non-members of the Communist Party.

14960 Q. Tell us about the national board, how the number of its membership was determined and what its  
14901 functions were, and how it was elected. A. Yes. By the way, I should mention that the constitution prescribes that the National Committee shall meet at least four times a year. The 1945 convention of the Communist Party elected a national committee of some 55 members and these were from all over the country. This created a great problem of how to conduct the work of the party in between meetings of the national committee. It was not practicable for 55 members of the National Committee to come together every week to conduct the every-day affairs of the Communist Party. So a national board was elected by the National Committee consisting pretty much of resident members of the National Committee, resident in New York, which was the headquarters, national headquarters, of the Communist Party.

The National Board was elected by a meeting of the National Committee that took place after 1945. At the 1948 convention, due to the fact that the size of the national committee was reduced sharply from 55 to 13, there was no provision for the election of a national board, and this

new national committee met much more regularly than national committees in the past.

Q. How was this board elected at that time? A. By the National Committee of the Communist Party, by a majority vote.

14927 Q. Will you state what this term or what understanding of this term democratic centralism you and your associates in the Communist Party had? A. Democratic centralism is that principle which governs the party organization and function. Democratic centralism means, first of all, the broadest democracy in the operation and functioning of the party. The constitution of the Communist Party of the United States lays down a number of principles to fulfill this concept of the broadest democracy, and that every member of the Communist Party not only has the right but the duty to participate and discuss the formulation of all party policies and programs.

All policies of the party are democratically arrived at. And I might say that the functioning of the Communist Party, its procedure at conventions, and so on, is a million times more democratic than the way the Republican and Democratic Parties function in this country.

14928 THE WITNESS: The centralism part of the concept has to do with, once the policies of the party are formulated, democratically, in the manner that I have described, by majority votes at conventions and so on, with delegates democratically elected, that once party policy or decisions are made by majority vote, then each and every member is obligated to carry out that decision as long as it remains in force, or until that decision is changed. This is our position because ours is a serious political party. We are not just a discussion organization or just a talking shop. We are a party that is interested in bringing about an improvement in the welfare of the American people, and



in finally achieving socialism. Therefore, after the broadest operation of democracy, we finally decide upon policies, and then we proceed to carry out those policies as effectively as we can. That is why we have this principle of centralism; that once policies are decided upon by a majority vote, that all members are obligated to carry out that policy.

14969 Q. Now, Mr. Gates, at any time since January 1946, when you took office as a member of the National Committee, has the Communist Party been affiliated with any other organization? A. It has not.

Q. I beg your pardon? A. It has not.

14970 Q. Has the Communist International been in existence at any time since the date that you took office on the National Committee? A. It was not in existence at anytime during that period.

Q. Do you know of an organization known as the Communist Information Bureau? A. I do know of such an organization.

Q. Is the Communist Party affiliated with that organization? A. The Communist Party of the United States is not affiliated to the Communist Information Bureau.

Q. Does the Communist Party pay any of its money, dues money or any other money, to the Communist Information Bureau? A. Well, we have never contributed so much as one cent to the Communist Information Bureau.

Q. Does the Communist Party pay or contribute any funds or give any financial assistance, direct or indirect, in any manner, shape or form to the Communist Information Bureau? A. None whatsoever.

Q. When and how did you first learn of the organization of the Communist Information Bureau? A. From Capitalist newspapers, reading it in the New York papers, the Times and Tribune and Daily News and so on, at the time that this was formed.



Q. Can you tell us approximately when that was? A. I believe it was some time in 1947 but I can't place the date more closely than that.

Q. After you learned through the New York papers, was there any discussion of this organization, that is, the Communist Information Bureau, was there any discussion of that organization in the National Board of the Communist Party of the United States? A. There took place some informal discussion, based on the reports that had appeared in the capitalist newspapers. But we withheld any official or formal discussion until such time as we were able to see the official documents of that event, the formation of the Communist Information Bureau.

Q. When you say official document, specifically what do you mean by that? A. I mean the reports that were made at that founding conference and the resolutions that were passed at that founding conference.

Q. Contained in what? A. They were contained in various publications that were published in Europe, and when those publications arrived in this country they were translated and made available to us.

Q. These were publications published for the public consumption, is that right? A. These were Communist Party publications in Europe, openly published. It is the same as our Political Affairs is published here in the United States.

Q. And that is what you meant by official documents when you said you waited to see the official documents?

14973 THE WITNESS:

When I said official documents what I meant was the reports which appeared in the capitalist press we did not consider to be authentic. They were just excerpts and were not complete. We didn't know whether they were garbled or not. We wanted to see the actual speeches, the actual text of

the speeches, and so on, that were made there. That is what I meant by official documents. Official of the Communist Information Bureau. That is what I meant.

14974- By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. After you received the publications, the Communist publications, which officially reported the news of the organization of the Communist Information Bureau, did the National Board have any further discussion? A. Yes, we did.

Q. What was the result of that discussion? A. The result of that discussion was the issuing of a statement signed by Mr. Foster, the Chairman of our party, and Mr. Dennis, the General Secretary of our Party, as to our position on the formation of the Communist Information Bureau.

Q. I show you Petitioner's Exhibit 368, in evidence, which is an article entitled "United States Communists decided not to join nine-party body," contained on page 2 of the Daily Worker of New York, Monday, November 3, 1947, and I ask you if that is the statement that you referred to when you said that the National Board voted and issued a statement. A. Well, what this is, it is a news story reporting the action taken by the Communist Party, and in the course of the news story it then gives the text of the statement of the Communist Party.

Q. I ask you to look at that text, and I ask if that is the accurate text of the statement issued by the Communist Party. A. It is, but there appears to be a typographical error in the paper which I regret, having been the editor of the paper at the time. But it is the statement, outside from that typographical error.

Q. Now, was that policy set forth in that statement carried out by the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. Has there ever been any change in that policy? A. No, there has not been.

Q. Did any representative of the Communist Party attend the meeting of the Communist Information Bureau referred to in Exhibit 368? A. You mean of the Communist Party of the United States?

Q. That is right. A. There was no representative of the Communist Party of the United States there attending any meeting.

Q. Has any representative of the Communist Party attended any subsequent meeting of the Communist Information Bureau? A. No.

Q. So that we will have the record clarified, when I say Communist Party, I mean Communist Party of the United States. I will try to say Communist Party of the 14976 United States but sometimes I inadvertently leave it out. So when I say Communist Party I mean Communist Party of the United States. Has any representative of the Communist Information Bureau visited the United States? A. I don't know whether any representative has ever visited the United States. I know that no representative has ever visited the Communist Party of the United States. That I know.

Q. Has the Communist Party received any written or oral directives or instructions from the Communist Information Bureau? A. We have never received any directives or instructions from the Communist Information Bureau.

Q. Has the Communist Party of the United States received any written or oral directives or instructions from any representative of the Communist Information Bureau? A. We have not.

Q. Has the Communist Party of the United States received any written Communications of any kind from the Communist Information Bureau? A. We have not.

Q. When you say "We have not," you are talking, of course, of up until the date you went to prison, is that right? A. Yes, I am talking about the entire period that I was a member of the National Committee until the 14977 time I went to prison. Of course, dating from the formation of this organization.



Q. And you are talking of the entire period during which you were in a position to have knowledge? That is right.

Q. Which ceased after you went to jail. You were then no longer in a position to have any knowledge, is that right? A. Aside from what I read in the newspaper I get in prison, the New York Times.

Q. Now, has the Communist Party received any written communication of any kind from the Communist Information Bureau? A. No.

Q. Prior to your imprisonment, did you read "Lasting Peace"? A. I did.

Q. Did you read it regularly? A. As regularly as I could. I may have missed some issues.

Q. Did Lasting Peace contain any directive or information to the Communist Party of the United States, instruction, rather, directive or instruction to the Communist Party of the United States? A. I never read any 14978 issues of Lasting Peace in which I saw any instructions or directives to the Communist Party of the United States, and the National Committee of the Party, during this period I am speaking of, never understood that it was receiving any such instructions or directives from Lasting Peace.

Q. Now, did you or your fellow associates, fellow members, of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States consider any of the contents of Lasting Peace as constituting a directive to the Communist Party of the United States? A. We did not.

Q. What was your purpose in reading Lasting Peace? A. My purpose was to gain information on world affairs. First of all as editor of the Daily Worker, I naturally was greatly interested in what was going on in the world, and was very desirous of gaining as broad a knowledge and as wide information as possible, and I considered many of the things that appeared in Lasting Peace very informed articles on the state of affairs in the various countries of the world, and very valuable to my own information and knowledge.



Furthermore, I was interested as a member of the National committee of the Communist Party in the affairs of other Communist Parties of the world. This newspaper, Lasting Peace, served as a medium for the publication of information as to what was going on within various communist parties throughout the world.

Q. What is the source of your knowledge of policies and activities of the Communist Information Bureau? A. The source of my knowledge is entirely from this newspaper, Lasting Peace, which publishes news about the Communist Information Bureau, and Communist parties throughout the world.

Q. Did you receive any information with respect to the Communist Information Bureau through any other press? A. Well, something may appear in a capitalist press. This newspaper, Lasting Peace, is publishing in Bucharest. During the years that we are speaking of there were reporters for capitalist newspapers in Bucharest. When this paper would come out on the streets they would get a scoop on the Daily Worker. They would get news of this before we would get copies of the Lasting Peace in New York. They would sometimes print excerpts in their newspapers in New York. So sometimes we would sort of get advance notice in the capitalist press as to what was to come in Lasting Peace when it finally arrived in the United States. Lasting Peace arrived in the United States sometimes several weeks after it was published, in fact sometimes several months, because they were often held up by some authorities, I don't know whom, the customs office, and their distribution in the United States was delayed for a considerable time.

Q. What is the source of your knowledge of the structure and methods of functioning of the Communist Information Bureau? A. Solely from what the Communist Information Bureau publishes and states itself in its newspaper Lasting Peace.

Q. Since you assumed your duties as a member of the National Committee, has the Communist Party of the United States received any directive or instructions from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. We have never received any directives or instructions from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Q. Or from any representative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. Nor from any representative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Q. Or from any official of the Soviet Union? A. Nor from any official of the Soviet Union government.

Q. Or from the Communist Party of any other country? A. We have never received any instructions or directives during this period which you are asking me about from a representative of the Communist Party of any other country.

Q. Or from a representative—I asked you before 14981—from the Communist Party of any other country, or from the representative of the Communist Party of any other country? A. Neither from the Communist Party of any other country or from the representative of the Communist Party of any other country.

Q. Since you assumed office as a member of the National Committee in 1946, January, has there been a representative of the Communist International in the United States?

A. There has not been because the Communist International has not been in existence during that period.

Q. And since that date, that is, when you assumed office in the National Committee, has there been any person in the United States who was the equivalent or acted as a representative of the Communist International? A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Do you know Gerhard Eisler? A. I know him, yes.

Q. When and where did you first meet him? A. I met Mr. Eisler for the first time some time in 1946, after I returned from the Army. I believe it was in early 1946 that I met him for the first time. I met him in the Borough of Queens

New York. He happened to live just a few blocks away from where I lived in Queens New York City. He asked to see me and I met him at his house, I believe, and we had 14982 a conversation there. What it was was that he learned that I had returned from the Army and that I had been stationed in Germany. Since he was expecting to return to Germany shortly he was very anxious to hear any news of what I had seen and what was going on in Germany.

Well, I wasn't able to tell him too much about that, but we had a little chat about Germany and what I had seen as a member of the Army in Germany, and that was the end of the conversation.

Q. Did you meet him on any other occasions? A. I met him on several other occasions since then. I once spoke at a meeting in Philadelphia, a public meeting, on the same platform with Mr. Eisler. During the trial at Foley Square, under which I was convicted, I think he visited the trial there one day and was in the audience, and I spoke to him for a moment in the corridor there in the courthouse. I believe I saw him at a reception once, a public reception, given in a hotel, for the Communist leaders who were under indictment under the Smith Act.

As a matter of fact, I think he was one of the speakers at that reception.

Those are the only occasions I have seen him except there may have been other public meetings or gatherings of this type where we may have just passed each other and said hello or something like that.

14983 Q. Did Eisler ever give you any directive or instruction with reference to the conduct of the affairs of the Daily Worker? A. He never did.

Q. Did he ever give you any directive or instruction with reference to the policies, or the affairs of the Communist Party of the United States? A. He did not.

Q. And did he ever give you any directives or instructions with reference to the activities of the Communist Party of

the United States? A. He never gave me any instructions or directives whatsoever.

Q. Did Eisler, in your presence, give any other member of the Communist Party any directive or instructions with reference to the policies and activities of the Communist Party of the United States? A. He did not.

Q. Did Eisler ever state in your presence that he was a representative of the Communist International? A. He did not.

Q. Or that he was the equivalent of a representative of the Communist International? A. He did not.

Q. Or that he was functioning as such? A. He did not.

Q. Did any of your associates, members of the Communist Party, and members of the National Committee, ever state, in your presence—or national board, for that matter—ever state in your presence that Eisler was a Communist International representative? A. No.

Q. Or that he was the equivalent of a Communist International representative or functioning as such? A. No.

Q. Did you ever hear that statement made by anyone in the Communist Party? A. No.

14988 Q. Now, since you assumed your duties as a member of the National Committee, how have the funds of the Communist Party been obtained? A. The funds of the Communist Party have been obtained entirely from the collection of dues on the part of the members, from the members of the Communist Party. That is prescribed in the constitution. And from donations from the party members as well as soliciting donations from the public in general. We held annual collection campaigns for the collection of funds to finance our activities. From the sale of literature, although that was primarily an expense rather than an income, but income would come in on it. These were all of the methods that we had of obtaining finances in the Communist Party of the United States.



Q. Did you or the Party obtain any money from any sources outside of the United States?

MR. PAISLEY: To his knowledge.

MR. MARCANTONIO: I beg your pardon.

MR. PAISLEY: To his knowledge.

MR. MARCANTONIO: Naturally, to his knowledge. It couldn't be anything outside of his knowledge.

MR. BROWN: Let's proceed. To your knowledge, Mr. Gates:

THE WITNESS: To my knowledge as a member of 14989 the Communist Party during that period, we received no moneys, no funds from outside of the United States of America.

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. Since you became editor of the Daily Worker in 1947, how has it been financed? A. The Daily Worker financed itself entirely through the sale of the paper, the sale of subscriptions to the paper, and through donations from the readers of the paper in the United States.

Q. What was the annual budget of the Daily Worker? A. Well, in the years that I was editor, the annual expenditures of the Daily Worker were on the average of—this includes Sunday Worker, the Daily and Sunday Worker—the annual expenditures were roughly three quarters of a million dollars, \$750,000.

Q. Before we go further with reference to the finance of the Daily Worker, I just want to make certain of one matter. I have asked you with respect to the Daily Worker, I now ask you with respect to the Sunday Worker. How was that financed, first? Answer that question. A. In exactly the same way as the Daily Worker is financed.

Q. And second, did the Sunday Worker receive any funds from any sources outside of the United States? A. No.

14990 Q. And the same question with respect to the Daily Worker, did it receive any funds from sources outside of the United States? A. Well, there may have been a subscriber in Europe who bought a subscription, and in that sense contributed the cost of that subscription.

Q. I mean outside of a subscriber or a subscription. I mean any other sources outside of the United States. A. No.

Q. That goes for both the Daily and Sunday Worker? A. Yes.

14998 Q. During the period of your membership on the National Committee, has the Communist Party sent any member or representative to any school, class,

14999 or institute in the Soviet Union? A. No.

Q. To any Communist School, class, or institute in any foreign country. A. No.

Q. To your knowledge, during this period, has any member or representative of the Communist Party attended any such school, class, or institute? A. A Communist School?

Q. That is right. A. No.

Q. During this period, has the Communist Party sent any member or representative to the Soviet Union for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of Communism? A. No.

Q. Has it sent any member or representative to any other country, foreign country, for that purpose? A. No.

Q. During the period of your membership on the National Committee, has the Communist Party reported its policies, plans, programs, or activities to the Soviet Government?

A. To the Soviet Government?

Q. That is right. A. No.

15000 Q. To the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. No.

Q. To the Communist International? A. No.

Q. To the Communist Information Bureau? A. No.

Q. To any representative of the Communist Information Bureau? A. No.

Q. To any representative of the Communist International? A. No.

Q. To any agency or representative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. No.

Q. During this period, has the Communist Party sent any member or representative abroad for the purpose of making any such report? A. No.

Q. During the period of your membership on the National Committee, has the Communist Party of the United States reported to the Government of the Soviet Union? A. No.

Q. And to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. No.

Q. And to the Communist Information Bureau? 15001 A. No.

15010 Q. Were there any discussions within the National Committee with reference to the size of the club? A. During this period yes, many discussions.

Q. What was said in these discussions? A. Well, 15011 there was a running discussion with pros and cons with respect to the size of the clubs. By the way, I would like to interpolate that as long as I have been in the party, since 1933, there has been this running discussion as to what should be the size of the clubs of the Communist Party. Now, discussion was as follows: That is, that there was one group that was in favor of continuing the clubs at a size of 25, and the arguments in favor of this was that the larger the clubs of the party the more attractive they would be for members of the party as well as for potential members of the party. That is, when you have a larger number in a club you could have a better social life, more active educational life, the club would be stronger, be able to do more things than a smaller club would be able to do.

These were the main reasons why larger clubs were favored in this discussion. This was the argument that has been put forward over the years, as well.

On the other hand, the arguments against this were that when you have a large club of the Communist Party, 25 or larger, and in the history of the party there have been clubs of the party that had as many as a hundred members or more, that it is difficult for the leadership of that club, large



club, to keep in touch with all of the members, and as a result of which many of the members are inactive and the leadership loses touch with them, and you don't have the maximum activity of the membership of the Communist Party that we are interested in. We are interested in bringing about a one hundred per cent activity on the part of the membership of the Communist Party. However, we have never attained that ideal, and I don't know whether it has been attained since I have gone to jail but that is the ideal that we have been working for.

An additional factor that began to play an increasing part in our discussions during this period now that I am discussing was the fact that a severe period of repression had set in for members of the Communist Party. This created a serious problem and created a serious situation among the rank and file membership of our party, and many questions were being raised by the members of the party as to what to do about this situation. We were forced to deal with this and take whatever necessary measures were needed. It was said in the discussion that many Communists were being deprived of their constitutional rights of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought, and that there was a whole series of measures instituted by government which jeopardized the means of livelihood of Communists as well as the personal safety and freedom of Communists. Among these measures were the Truman loyalty probe and purge as a result of which Communists, for mere membership in the Communist Party, and for no deeds or acts of any kind, were disqualified from working for the government, a whole series of measures that were taken in many states depriving Communists who were teachers of the right to be teachers in the public school system of the country for the mere fact of membership in the Communist Party, and not for any of their teachings in those schools; the fact that the Taft-Hartley law had been passed and interfered with the right of Communists within the unions to be elected

freely by their membership to office in those unions under penalty of losing collective bargaining rights with the National Labor Relations Board; the fact that in many plants, many factories, of the nation, workers were fired for mere membership in the Communist Party. All of these various things that had happened, then climaxed by the announcement of Secretary of Labor Schwollenbach of the intention of the Government to outlaw the Communist Party and then finally the indictment of the 11 Communist leaders under the Smith Act, their conviction, and its being upheld by the Supreme Court and the passage of the McCarran Act and its application with the ordering of the hearing in the case of the Communist Party.

Now, particularly following the conviction of the Communist leaders under the Smith Act and its being upheld by the Supreme Court, and the following statement that was made by an Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Whearty—

MR. ABT: Will you spell that?

15014 THE WITNESS: W-h-e-a-r-t-y. —before a congressional committee to the effect that the Department of Justice was ready once the Supreme Court had upheld the conviction of the 11 Communist leaders at Foley Square, to proceed against 12,000 members of the Communist Party. Following especially these events and the passage of the McCarran Act, we were confronted with the situation in the Party with many questions of fears on the part of the rank and file that it was necessary to take the measures to protect the Constitutional rights of members of the Communist Party.

We discussed this and we said this would be entirely unnecessary, any measures of this kind to protect our members, if it were not for the fact that the members of the Communist Party were being illegally deprived of the Constitutional rights that all other Americans enjoyed. We therefore then decided to take a number of measures to bring about the protection of the lives, the safety and the means of livelihood of these members of the Communist Party.

Now, these measures that I will enumerate that we took had nothing whatsoever to do with concealing the views or the program of the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, it was because we wanted to be able to continue to reveal the views and policies and program of the Communist Party to the American people that we were determined to protect our members in their constitutional rights. We said in this discussion that the American history bore out this stand on the part of the Communist Party, that all of the great democratic and revolutionary movements in American history were forced at one time or another to resort to methods of secrecy as a result of repressive measures, repressive laws that were in operation against them, and that in all cases in past American history where these methods of secrecy were necessary, that they were not for the purpose of concealing the program of these movements but were for the purpose of protecting the people involved in these movements from the deprivation of their legal, constitutional, democratic rights.

In taking this stand about American history we referred to a number of events, we referred to the fact that the early American revolutionists in their struggle against the British Empire were forced to resort to methods of secrecy, the committees of correspondence. The very Boston Tea Party was composed of men who were forced to disguise themselves as one hundred per cent Americans. And, of course, the revolution itself.

The movement against the British Empire which was then in power in the United States in many respects, of course, had to be secret.

15016 Then, following this situation there was the situation that arose at the time of the alien sedition acts in 1798. In this particular situation the Jeffersonians at that time were driven largely underground. They were denounced as agents of a foreign power, as agents of revolutionary France, because of their opposition to those in America, to those who were then in control of the Govern-



ment, who wished to declare war against revolutionary France. The stand of the Jeffersonians was that such a war was not in the interests of the American people and they opposed such a war.

15017 THE WITNESS: The Jeffersonians were forced as a result of the alien sedition acts, as a result of which many of their leaders were put in prison, to organize secret clubs, political clubs. Well, finally, as we know, Jefferson was elected and the alien sedition acts were nullified.

15018 We further mentioned the case of the abolitionist movement prior to the Civil War. They certainly organized secretly and, as a matter of fact, their main operation was called the underground railroad, and was the only means that they would have of facilitating the passage of fugitive slaves from slavery to freedom, although this was against the law at that time. And we said that history has now given its judgment as to who were the real lawbreakers of that period, the abolitionists, who were helping to create the situation of freedom, or those who passed such laws as the fugitive slave law, who propounded the Dread Scott decision and so on.

Then there was the very important historical antecedent of the trade union movement, which, in its beginning in the United States of America, had to organize entirely as secret organizations. They were declared conspiracies in the early days, conspiracies against the Government of the United States, by various judicial decisions and laws. After many decades of struggle, these trade unions won their rights. But even up until modern times and even up until the present time, the unions still have not won their full legal rights of organization.

I have already testified the other day about a period when the big industries of this country like the steel industry were unorganized, were open shop, and not until the  
15019 coming of the CIO in 1935 and thereafter did these unions win legal recognition.

This situation continues in this country even now in certain areas of the South where workers remain unorganized and are forced to operate secretly in many instances in order to prevent their being blacklisted. These were all examples that we based ourselves on to show that all of the democratic and progressive movements of the past in our country had to go through this process because of illegal and unconstitutional and undemocratic obstacles that were put in their path, and that there was no attempt on the part of any of these to conceal from the American people their aims, their intentions and their purposes, only to protect their individual persons and to protect their constitutional rights.

We, on the basis of this thinking, therefore, decided to sharply reduce the size of the membership of the clubs of the Communist Party. We decided to reduce them so that there would be less possibility of penetration by either government or company spies, and the bringing about of either blacklisting of these members of the party who may have been working in industry or to bring about possible physical harm to the members of the party. We felt that with small organizations if, indeed, some spies of this type would penetrate into the organization, well, then, they could do the least possible damage. In a small club they would be able to finger just a few people, and they would only be able to damage just a few human beings. In a big club they would, of course, be able to do much more damage.

Then we took other measures as well, and this was to eliminate any lists of membership in the organization. In prior years we used to have membership lists, and we did away with these lists as well for fear—

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. Was there anything said in those discussions with respect to FBI informants that had been infiltrated into the Communist Party? A. Well, we knew very well that these informers had infiltrated into the party. We knew it very

well from the testimony of many of these informers at various proceedings that took place.

It was said by these informers that they would report to the FBI as long as they were present in the ranks of the Communist Party anything that would take place in the Communist Party, even if a member of the Communist Party bought a pair of shoes they would report that to the FBI. This was testified to at Foley Square in my presence. We considered this an outrageous and immoral and undemocratic invasion, to say nothing of our constitutional rights, of our privacy as human beings, the privacy of our 15021 homes and so on, that the FBI has no business inquiring into matters of this nature and we are fully justified therefore in preventing the Government from invading our privacy in this fashion.

Q. Did there ever come a time, therefore, when the club membership was reduced to a size of no more than five? A. Yes, there did.

Q. When did this occur? A. Well, as I mentioned before, after our conviction and it was upheld by the Supreme Court, and the statement by a representative of the Department of Justice before a Congressional Committee, about the 12,000 pending prosecutions, and the passage of the McCarran Act.

Q. What action was taken and by what body, to bring about this change in the reduction of size? A. The national committee decided upon a reduction in the size of the clubs. It was decided upon the elimination of membership lists. We decided—and this took place in 1949—not to issue membership books for the time being.

Q. But prior to that time? A. Well, membership books were issued in 1948 and all of the years previous to that. In 1949 we did not issue membership books. In 1950 we did not issue membership books, and in 1951, up until the time that I went to jail in July of 1951 we had not yet issued membership books.



15022 As I said before, all of these measures were taken by us as defensive measures. We felt that we were compelled to do this, that we did it under compulsion, and that we did not wish to take measures of this sort. During all of this existence of the party that is, in the time that I have been a member of the party and during this period that I am speaking about particularly now, we have tried to achieve full legality for the Communist Party of the United States. By full legality I mean the rights equal to all other political parties in the United States. We have never quite succeeded at any period in achieving that full legality. The Communist Party of the United States has always been discriminated against to one extent or another in its entire history.

. . . . .

15038 Q. Are the leaders of the Communist Party subject to and do they recognize the alleged disciplinary power of the Soviet Government? A. I know of no disciplinary power of the Soviet Government over an American communist, and we recognize no such thing.

Q. Do the leaders of the Communist Party consider themselves subject to the alleged disciplinary power of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. The leaders of the Communist Party of the United States?

Q. That is right. A. We recognize no such talk.

Q. Of the Communist International? A. No.

Q. And of the Communist Information Bureau? A. No.

Q. Or any agencies of the Soviet Government or of the Communist Information Bureau or the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or of the Communist International? A. No.

Q. Is there any principle or doctrine of Communism which binds the American Communists to execute the decision of foreign Communist leaders? A. There is

15039 no such principle. I know of no such decisions of foreign Communist leaders that were ever made with intent to be binding on American Communist leaders. And in any case, American Communist leaders are subject

only to the discipline of the American Communist Party, subject only to the policies of the American Communist Party.

Q. And the decisions of the American Communist Party?

A. And the decisions of the American Communist Party.

Q. Does the principle of democratic centralism bind all Communists in the United States to execute decisions of the so-called world communist movement? A. No: The principle of democratic centralism is as I described yesterday, and binds American Communists to carry out only those decisions which have been democratically arrived at by the Communist Party of the United States.

15042 Q. Now I am going to ask you a question which has been asked here by the Petitioner repeatedly. To your knowledge, has the Communist Party ever knowingly deviated from the views and policies of the Government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

15043 THE WITNESS: The central and chief aim, purpose, policy, and the sole purpose of the Communist Party of the United States of America, is never to deviate from the true national interests of the American people. That is the standard by which we operated. That is the straight line that we try to walk, and from which we try not to deviate. If it is true, as it is, that in many instances, particularly in the case of world affairs, that the views of the Communist Party of the United States of America are similar to or identical with views of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that only goes to show that there is no difference, no contradiction, between the national interest of the people of the United States or the national interest of the people of the Soviet Union, or, for that matter, of any other people of the world. It is our position that the national interests of all peoples on earth coincide and are identical. And, therefore, it should not be surprising that

any organizations or parties of any country that base themselves on the true national interest of the 15044 peoples of their countries should come to have similar or identical views.

Now, the Communist Party of the United States of America is a completely independent, a fully autonomous organization. We formulate all of our own policies without dictation or domination or control by anyone else outside of our country. And we formulate all of those policies on the basis of a scientific approach towards world problems and domestic problems, a scientific approach which consists of the general principles of Marxism-Leninism. But these general principles of Marxism-Leninism do not constitute the program of the Communist Party of the United States of America. They are general, theoretical principles. They are general, scientific principles. But they must be applied in every situation according to time, place, and circumstances. And only that is the program of the Communist Party of the United States of America, which is the result of the application of our understanding of the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism to the particular concrete conditions in the United States of America and in accordance with the democratic and revolutionary traditions of the United States of America.

In dealing with the scientific approach, it is not 15045 surprising that adherents of a certain science, as very often happens in the field of physical sciences, may, independently, simultaneously in various parts of the world, come to the same scientific conclusions, and that is so because science is universal. Science knows no national boundaries. The famous apple of Newton drops at the same rate of speed to the ground in the Soviet Union as it does in the United States of America.

The Communist Party of the United States of America has not always—well, let me put it this way: The views, policies of the Communist Party of the United States of America are not in many respects similar or identical to



the views and policies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the very simple reason that different situations exist in two countries. In the United States of America we have capitalism in power, and the Communist Party of the United States of America has developed a program for struggle against capitalism and for socialism. In the Soviet Union you have socialism already in power, and capitalism has been abolished. The problems in this respect are very different, especially with respect to domestic affairs. For example, the Communist Party of the United States has a program and policy with respect to the Taft-Hartley Law. I don't know whether the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has a program with respect to the Taft-Hartley in that country. We stand for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law. The Soviet Union to my knowledge has no  
15046 position on the Taft-Hartley law in their country.

They long ago did away with the situation where Taft-Hartley laws were possible.

Now, in saying this, I wish also to say that the Communist Party of the United States has often agreed with the views and positions of the Soviet Union on peace. And again, this has been because of the independent analysis and independent decisions of the Communist Party of the United States, entirely formulated by itself and not as a result of any foreign domination or control. And we have agreed with these policies of the Soviet Union on peace because we have believed them to be peaceful policies, and we have believed them to be policies which are in the interest of the American people, applying our own standard, and our standard is that we are devoting all of our efforts to the cause of peace, to the cause of preventing a third world war.

We apply that yardstick to any views or positions put forward by the Soviet Union on the issue of peace and world affairs. And if we have, as we have, agreed with such views of the Soviet Union, it is because we believe that they are views in the interest of peace and therefore in the interest of the American people.

I wish to state, not to repeat at length what I 15047 have already testified and on previous days, that it is our view, because the Soviet Union is a socialist country, because it is a country where capitalism and production for profits have been abolished, that there are no forces in the Soviet Union that have any interests in conducting aggressive wars against the peoples of other lands or against other nations. And, therefore, it is but natural that in a country with such an economic and political structure as in the Soviet Union, namely a socialist one, that such a country can only be interested in peace and is opposed to wars of aggression. It is therefore not surprising that we should be in agreement with such peace views.

Furthermore, we are a working class party. And just as in the United States of America the Communist Party of the United States of America always takes the side of the workers against the capitalists in the conflicts that take place daily and the struggles that take place daily between those two classes, so too on an international scale, the Communist Party of the United States takes its side on the side of labor and against capital.

To conclude on this, I wish again to emphasize what I said in the beginning, that the sole determinant of the views, the programs and the policies of the Communist Party of the United States is our understanding of, "Will it be in the interest of the majority of the American People?" That is how we judge all events that take place in the world.

15048 Q. With respect to the question of deviation, have there been times when the Communist Party of the United States has taken a position before the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has taken a similar position?

A. Yes, many times. And we take a position many times on things that, to my knowledge, the Soviet Union has never taken a position on.

15049 Q. Is it a part of the teachings of the Communist Party that the Government of the United States is to be overthrown by force or violence? A. It is not.

Q. Does the Communist Party of the United States have any position with reference to the role of force and violence in the process of social change? I will withdraw that question and ask instead first: What meaning does the term historic mission of the working class as used in the preamble of the constitution mean to you and your associates in the Communist Party?

MR. ABT: Does the witness have the constitution before him?

THE WITNESS: I have.

The meaning of this term, the historic mission of the working class to us Communists, the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States, is the eventual establishment of socialism in the United States. We mean by this the following methods and means by which socialism is to be established in the country. The Communist Party of the United States of America advocates the peaceful and constitutional road to socialism. The communist party of the United States of America believes that the Constitution of the United

15050 States and its bill of rights is an instrument that is capable of being used by a majority of the people of the United States led by the working class in the achievement, ultimately, of socialism. There have been at various times Communists who have not understood, or have not agreed with this interpretation of the constitution. The National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States believes that such Communists are wrong. And we base ourselves on the American history, in particularly the controversy that went on in the ranks of the abolitionists prior to the Civil War. At that time there were two factions among the abolitionists, one of which said that the constitution of the United States was a slave document, and, therefore, that all those opposed to slavery should have nothing to do with the United States constitution, should not



participate in elections, and that the north should secede from the United States and leave the South to itself. There was another group of abolitionists led by Frederick Douglass which said that although the constitution of the United States at that time had made certain compromises with slavery, that, nevertheless, in the main, the constitution was a revolutionary document, was a profoundly democratic document, was a democratic instrument, and was very capable of being used by the people of the United States for the purpose of abolishing chattel slavery. We take that lesson for the present time in the United States, that the constitution which was born in revolution, which at 15051 that time was the most democratic document in the world, to which was added the bill of rights as a result of a struggle by the people, to which was added the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments as a result of the revolutionary struggle by the American people in the Civil War, that this constitution is a framework and presents, offers, channels, democratic channels, which, if they remain open, can be used by the American people led by the working class to establish socialism eventually.

Our position is that the issue before the American people now, or in the foreseeable future is not the issue of socialism or capitalism. It is our position that the issue before the American people is peace or war, democracy or fascism. Therefore, we lend all of our efforts and our resources towards the organization of the broadest possible coalition of class forces in the United States and of parties and organizations representing those class forces, against those who are responsible for the danger of war and aggression, against those who are responsible for the danger of fascism in our country, namely against the big trusts, monopolies, the few bankers, financiers and industrialists, who own and operate the industries, economy and the government of our country.

When I say we stand for the broadest possible coalition of class forces and the organizations that represent those

class forces, we mean all of those forces in America  
 15052 who are exploited by the big monopolies of this country, and we mean in the first place the working class, we mean the farmers, we mean the Negro people, and we mean also the middle-classes, professional classes, small and independent businessmen—all of these are oppressed and exploited by the big monopolies and leave conflicting interests with the big monopolies. We stand for the uniting of all those forces, regardless of their political beliefs, regardless of their agreement or disagreement with Communism which is not the issue today, as the only way to prevent war and fascism. And to secure the victory of this coalition that I speak of over the monopolies, we advocate the method of participation in the election process, not only once every four years, but through the building up of the economic and political organizations of the people in the course of the periods in between elections every four years, in the course of their struggles for the improvement of their economic welfare, for the preservation and extension of democratic rights, for equal rights for the Negro people and for peace.

We favor participation in the election process and to bring about the election of a government based upon this coalition of which I have been speaking, and which we also advocate shall take the form of a new people's party, an anti-monopoly party, a party that stands for peace,  
 15053 for democracy and for economic welfare.

Now, such a government in our view, when elected, will not be elected on a Communist Party platform, will not be a party or a coalition or government that favors socialism. It will be a government that stands for peace; democracy, and the economic well-being of the majority of the people. It will be a government that is opposed to the monopolies, and a government whose aim will be to restrict and to curb those monopolies in their warfare against the interests of the overwhelming bulk of the American people. But it is then our view, as leaders of the Communist Party that once such an anti-monopoly government is elected that

the monopolists in this country will not take that lying down and will not gracefully move over and accede to the wishes of the majority of the electorate.

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. Now, Mr. Gates, in answer to my question, is it a part of the teaching of the Communist Party that the government of the United States should be overthrown by force and violence, you answered no. Now I ask you this question: Does the Communist Party of the United States have any position with reference to the role of force and violence in the process of social change? A. Well, this is what I was—

Q. I know you were, and I wanted to interrupt you 15054 there so as to put that question in its proper place.

A. Basing ourselves upon past history, particularly upon the lessons of the American Civil War, and also upon the lessons of the Spanish Civil War of 1936 to 1938, and basing ourselves also upon the long, bloody history of the monopolies in this country, such as the violent thrusts against the workers, in the big trustified industries, it is the position of the Communist Party that the monopolists, the rich, the propertied, will resort to any means to preserve their power, and to preserve their profits, including the means of violence, to thwart the will of the American people, to prevent that will from being executed, or, failing this and such an anti-monopoly government being elected, as I said, to then use violence to bring about the overthrow of such a people's government.

Now, I said that we based this understanding upon American history. The Civil War—that was a war in which the people did elect a people's president, Abraham Lincoln, and this represented a big change in political power in the United States, transferred the political power from the slave owners to the young and growing capitalist class in the north. And the program of the Lincoln Government when it was elected in 1860, or platform of the Republican Party, was not at that time a revolutionary platform. The



platform of the Republican Party in 1860 was  
 15055 against the extension of slavery to the territories  
 and to other states from the ones in which they were  
 then operating. The Republican platform at that time did  
 not include the revolutionary provision of the abolition of  
 chattel slavery which the Abolitionists were very much in  
 favor of. At that time, the abolitionists, including the Com-  
 munist of that day, were bitterly critical of the Republican  
 Party and Abraham Lincoln for not being in favor of the  
 abolition of slavery in 1860 although nevertheless they sup-  
 ported Abraham Lincoln, despite this criticism. Then what  
 happened, as everybody knows, the armed rebellion of the  
 slave owners—

15061 THE WITNESS: Well, I was interrupted at the very  
 moment when I was coming to the force and violence.  
 That is that force and violence did take place in the Civil  
 War and it was on the part of the slave owners against the  
 legally elected government of the United States. That is the  
 first important lesson for us American Communists in the  
 position that we put forward now with respect to what road  
 the American people should take towards socialism. The  
 second lesson of that Civil War was that this Lincoln gov-  
 ernment which had been elected on a reform basis, and not  
 on a revolutionary basis, and which was opposed to the  
 revolutionary method in 1860, prior to the Civil War, was  
 forced by historic necessity, by military necessity, in the  
 course of the Civil War, to take revolutionary measures  
 and to become a revolutionary government through the  
 emancipation proclamation and the abolition of chattel  
 slavery in the United States of America. Now, our Com-  
 munist Party applies that to the present period in this  
 way: That, as I said, we favor the election of this peace  
 government which is not a Communist Government, as Mr.  
 Paisley stated, and I did not testify that, I said  
 15062 exactly the opposite—that it was not a government  
 dedicated to socialism but was a coalition government

with a program, a limited program, of opposition to fascism and to war, and it was for curbing the monopolies and not yet for abolishing capitalism, that we favored the election of such a government just as such a government was elected in the Civil War by the people, on a reform program and not on a revolutionary program.

But it is then the position of our party that to that extent that this new peace government and anti-monopoly government, that has just been elected by the American people proceeds to put into effect these measures against the monopolies to curb the unrestricted profiteering of these monopolies in the interest of the people, to curb their pro-war and pro-fascist activities, that these monopolists will begin to resist and to resist with all means up to and including violence, just as the overthrown slave owners did in the Civil War.

But it will be violence by these monopolists against the legally elected government of the United States of America. And it is the position of the Communist Party with respect to this that we would warn this new government that unless it took measures to anticipate this possible violence on the part of the monopolists that these monopolists would organize an armed rebellion against the government just as has happened so many times in history, it happened 15063 in our Civil War, it happened in the Spanish Civil War as I have already testified.

The measures that we would advocate in warning this government would be that they should remove in the armed forces, from the leadership of all the armed forces, all of those generals and admirals and so on who are sympathetic to and agents of the monopolists, and to replace them with officers who are sympathetic to the cause of the common people.

And the same thing would go for the police force. So that it would not be possible for these monopolists to use the positions that they have in the armed forces, that they have built up over so many decades, against a legally

elected government of the United States. We said that in the Civil War, in the United States, that most of the regular army of the United States Government went over to the side of the slave owners, and that in the Civil War in Spain most of the regular army went over to the side of Franco and Hitler and Mussolini, and against the legally elected government.

It is because the Spanish people's government didn't take the advice of the Spanish Communist Party, didn't clean the General Francos out of the Spanish army that he was successful in organizing a rebellion against this legally elected government. And it was our position that just as our

15064 Civil War reform government of Lincoln was forced

by necessity, and finally military necessity, to take revolutionary measures, just so this peace government which we advocate the election of will be forced by necessity to take revolutionary measures in order to prevent the monopolists from trying to overthrow this peacefully elected government by force and violence.

Now, we do not predict, nor do we try to spell out in every detail the course of events with respect to the actual establishment of socialism in the United States. No one can do that, and we don't try to blueprint that. All we can do is to lay down the path that we want the American people to follow. The path that we think is the most peaceful path. The path that we think will be at the least cost to the overwhelming majority of the American people. And that path is the one that I have outlined, the path of taking the peaceful and the constitutional road towards election of a peace government, and then urging that peace government to take additional measures to thwart any attempt at armed rebellion against a legally elected government by the monopolists of this country.

Now, we state with respect to this, that this is in no way contradictory to Marxist-Leninist principles. We state that this is in no way contradictory to the principle of dictatorship of the proletariat according to which the bour-



15065/ geoise state must be shattered to make way for the new worker state.

It is no contradiction because in the course of the struggle of this peace government, this legally elected peace government, against the resistance of the monopolies and the attempts of the monopolies to organize an armed rebellion against this government, that the bourgeoisie state in the course of this will be shattered in the sense of the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat. When I say that we will advocate that this government take measures to remove from the leadership of the armed forces these agents of monopoly and replace them with agents of the working class, to place in the leadership of the police forces men who are sympathetic to the people and not to the rich, that is this shattering of the bourgeoisie state. It is our position that this can be done peacefully by the legally elected government in the course of events. The only violence that will or can arise will come from the efforts of a small clique, and I do not include, as Mr. Paisley said, among the monopolies and industrialists and financiers of this country the small group whose policies run so counter to the majority of the American people, the small stockholders and small businessmen of our country, and small property owners. On the contrary, it is these small stockholders and small businessmen and small property owners that are fleeced every day of 15066 the year by the monopolies.

15069 By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. Mr. Gates, to whom do you owe allegiance? A. I owe allegiance to the United States of America.

Q. Have you ever taken the oath of allegiance? A. I have, many times.

Q. Will you state the occasions on which you took the oath of allegiance? A. As I have testified before, I took the oath of allegiance as a child and in school, when I was in the Color Guard at this public school that I testified to; and, of course, throughout my school career.

There was one specific instance in which I led a meeting of functionaries of the Communist Party of New York City in an oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Q. I didn't hear the last sentence, after the words "functionaries of the Communist Party of New York City." What was that? A. I led a meeting of functionaries of the 15070 Communist Party of New York City in an oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Q. You mean in taking the oath of allegiance? A. Yes. Well, I will describe it. This was in December of 1941, immediately after I had been sworn into the armed forces of the United States of America. I was sworn in on December 17, and the Army then gave me three or four days' leave to take care of my affairs before I would actually be inducted. And in that three or four-day period, I think it was two or three days after, I don't remember exactly the date, after December 17, a meeting took place in New York of some 2500 leaders of the Communist Party in New York City. I think it was in St. Nicholas Arena of New York City. I was introduced at that meeting as having just become a member of the United States Army. I then asked the audience to stand and to have them repeat after me, and I faced the flag, the American flag that was on the platform. I saluted the flag, and I said—and they repeated after me—"I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

And, of course, in the United States Army, I have, of course, taken various oaths as required by the regu- 15071 lations of the Army.

Q. At the times you took this oath, did you have any mental reservations? A. I had no mental reservations whatsoever. Moreover, that oath of allegiance meant much more to me as a leader of the Communist Party than it did when I was a school child taking an oath of allegiance, the same oath.

Q. Now, at this time, now, do you have any mental reservations with reference to the oath of allegiance? A. None at all.

Q. What does the oath signify to you and your associates in the Communist Party? A. It signifies that we owe our primary allegiance to the people of the United States of America. We understand by the flag of the United States of America, a flag that was born in revolution, a flag that became known to the entire world as a flag of freedom, a flag that was carried by the American people in the Revolutionary and Civil War, and to us that flag represents a flag of freedom.

There have been at various times in the history of the Communist Party of the United States, Communists who have felt that the American flag had become not a flag of freedom, but a flag of oppression. These American Communists felt this way because of the fact that on various occasions the monopolists who rule our country had made use of the American flag to cover up their own greed and selfishness, and to have the flag follow the dollar, so 15072 to speak, into other lands; and the position of the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States at the present time is that those American Communists who felt that way were absolutely wrong; that the American flag belongs to the American people; and notwithstanding the fact that there are some individuals in our country who do make use of the false cloak of patriotism to mask their own loyalty and allegiance to the American dollar, that we should not surrender this glorious flag and its wonderful traditions to these traducers and betrayers of that wonderful and glorious tradition of our American flag and the American people.

We further understood by this oath of allegiance and the phrase, "one Nation, indivisible," that we do not have in our country at the present time one nation indivisible; that this is a goal still to be achieved by the American people. And we Communists work for the achievement of that goal.



Our position is that we do not have one nation indivisible, because our nation is divided into rich and poor, into mutually antagonistic classes. We do not have one nation indivisible, because a small white ruling minority oppresses the Negro people of our country. It is our position, that when socialism is established in the United States of America, and classes are abolished, and all people will work for a living, and when the oppression of the Negro people is  
 15073 wiped out and we have a free association of peoples on the basis of full equality in the United States, that then we will truly have "one nation, indivisible."

Furthermore, we understood by the following phrases of the oath of allegiance, the phrase "liberty and justice for all," that there does not exist at the present time in our country "liberty and justice for all;" that there is one justice in our country for the rich, and another justice for the poor; that there is one law for the white people, and another law for the Negro people; that there is one law for all Americans, and another law for the Communists.

It is our stand that when, ultimately, socialism is established in the United States of America, that we will then truly have "liberty and justice for all," one law for all.

Q. Have you taken an oath of allegiance to any nation other than the United States? A. Never.

Q. Do you owe allegiance to any nation other than the United States? A. No.

Q. Have you engaged in any activities which bear on the matter of your allegiance? A. I consider that all of my activities as a Communist for the past 20 years, and everything

I have said and done in the course of those 20 years,  
 15074 in the two wars in which I have fought, have been in allegiance to the United States of America.

I would defy anyone to find anything in my life; anything in the deeds that I have done, which has ever run contrary to the interests of the people of the United States of America.

Q. What does "patriotism" mean to you and your associates in the Communist Party? A. "Patriotism" means to us a devotion to the best and highest interests of the American people. "Patriotism" does not mean, to us, loyalty to capitalism, and to the minority in our country which rules the capitalist system.

It is our position that the interests of this small capitalist class in our country are contrary to the interests of the majority of the American people, and that true patriotism, therefore, lies in devotion and loyalty to the interests of the majority of the people, the working people, rather than to this small group of industrialists and bankers.

Q. During your membership on the National Committee, did any of the teachings of the Communist Party of the United States deal with the question of patriotism? A. Yes.

Q. And during that period, what did the Communist Party teach with reference to the meaning of "patriotism"? A. We taught that we were in full agreement with the sentiments of Mark Twain, who wrote, in the "Connecticut Yankee," that loyalty to the United States of America does not mean loyalty to outworn institutions. He said that outworn institutions are like rags, like clothing that has become rags, and that loyalty to outworn institutions is like being loyal to rags. He said, rather, it is loyalty to speak out and to oppose any institutions that ever become outworn institutions, and that never serve the people; and that it is disloyal to the people not to speak out loud and clear when anyone has an opinion that such institutions have become inimical to the interests of the American people.

We taught further, in the words of Carl Schurz, who was a Senator from Missouri in the Civil War Days, and who was a member of President Lincoln's Cabinet, the statement of Carl Schurz in contrast to the statement made by Stephen Decatur. Stephen Decatur made the famous historical statement, "Our country, right or wrong." Carl Schurz said, in connection with this statement of Stephen Decatur, "Our

country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right. When wrong, to be set right." And we express full agreement with this statement of Carl Schurz.

It is our position that it is not patriotism to support any and all policies of a particular Administration of the United States Government just because it is the United States Government. If those policies are wrong,

they should be opposed. If they are right, they should be supported. And we have adhered to that position.

Furthermore, it is our position on the issue of patriotism that the failure of the people of Germany to follow the precepts stated by Carl Schurz, that is, the fact that the people of Germany under Hitler did follow the slogan of "My country, right or wrong," that they obeyed Hitler because he was the head of the government, whether they thought he was right or wrong—that this led the German people to disaster, and they betrayed their own interests, to say nothing of the catastrophe that they brought upon mankind.

We say, moreover, that it had been established, and we were in full concurrence, by the Nurnberg conspiracy trial of the Nazi war aggressors, the Nazi war criminals, Goering and Hess and Kuntze, in which the United States Government was an official participant, this Nurnberg tribunal laid down the principle that it was no defense on the part of anyone, who was a member of a nation whose government had conducted an aggressive and criminal war, to say that, "Well, they participated in that war because they had to obey the orders of that government." The Nurnberg trial declared the complicity and the guilt of all those who took the position that they were not to blame because they were only carrying out orders.

And we understand from this, also, that if we understand that a war in which our government or a particular administration might plunge our country, that if that war was an unjust war, that if that war was a criminal war, an aggressive war, that we were duty-bound, in the interests of American patriotism, as well as interna-



tional law as declared by the Nurnberg tribunal—in which our United States Government participated—that we were duty-bound to oppose such war.

15083 Q. Are you familiar with the slogan or phrase, "Convert the imperialist war into civil war"?

A. I am.

15084 Q. During your membership on the National Committee, has the Communist Party of the United States ever advanced this slogan? A. It has not, nor has the Communist Party of the United States ever advanced the slogan in any war that the United States has participated in during the life of the Communist Party in our country.

Q. How does the Communist Party of the United States characterize the present Korean War? A. It characterizes it as an unjust and unnecessary war of intervention of Wall Street against the people of Korea.

15085 Q. Has it called for converting the Korean War into civil war? A. Never at any time.

Q. What does it advocate with reference to the Korean War? A. It advocates, has advocated and does advocate, a peaceful settlement of that war on the basis of a just and democratic peace: It advocates a cease fire around the 38th Parallel. It advocates an armistice, to be followed by the withdrawal of all foreign troops from both sides; the peaceful settlement and unification of Korea by the people of Korea themselves, without interference from outside; the return of Formosa to China; the recognition of China by the United States; and the entrance of China, the admission of China, into the United Nations, on the Security Council.

15123

## CROSS EXAMINATION

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Mr. Gates, you testified you were one of the defendants in the case of the United States versus Dennis and others, that you are now serving your sentence of five years, is that right? A. That is correct.

Q. You and the other defendants in that case were convicted of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

15124 Q. That in substance was the charge? A. The substance of the charge was merely our thoughts and ideas, that is correct. No overt acts.

Q. Weren't you charged with conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of this government by force and violence? A. Yes.

Q. Now, the other defendants in that case were all members of your National Committee, were they not? A. All of the defendants were members of the National Committee, that is right.

15130 Q. And you say at college you learned that the capitalist system was destined to be superseded by a higher form of society, socialism, and that has actually taken place in one country on the face of the earth, is that correct? A. Yes.

Q. Now, that country, of course, is Russia, Soviet Russia, right? A. It is the Union of Socialist-Soviet Republics, yes.

Q. Now, you Communists claim that they have socialism in Russia now? A. Yes.

Q. And that Communism has not yet even been attained there? A. No.

15137 Q. Now, Mr. Gates, you will admit, will you not, that there is a world Communist movement? A. Well,

I won't admit it just like that, in terms that you understand the world Communist movement, or in the terms that the world Communist movement is stated in the allegations of your petition. I don't admit there is any such kind of world Communist movement.

Q. Do you admit that there is a world Communist movement of any kind? A. Yes, I do.

Q. You have written that many times in your own writings in Political Affairs, have you not? A. Of course.

15156 Q. There is no doubt, Mr. Gates, about your joining the Communist Party in Youngstown in 1933, is there? A. No.

Q. Didn't you tell the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 28, 1948, that you joined the Communist Party in 1941? A. I said nothing of the kind. There is a misprint in that Senate Judiciary Committee meeting. It wasn't the only misprint in that testimony. It is ridiculous.

Q. Had you noticed that before? A. I never noticed it until it was brought to my attention at Foley Square when I testified at Foley Square, and I made the correction at that time, as I am doing again now.

Q. You did see it in the Senate reports? Did you see that answer, 1941? A. When it was brought to my attention at the Foley Square testimony.

15160 Q. And you left Youngstown in January, 1937, and volunteered as a member of the International Brigade in Spain? A. I volunteered to fight in Spain, yes.

Q. And you had no training as a soldier? A. None whatsoever.

Q. And you say you fired three rounds of ammunition during the time you were there? A. In my period of training, before I went into combat, yes.

Q. Did you fire any ammunition in combat? A. Yes.



Q. Well, that three rounds of ammunition, you meant to restrict that to training, before combat? A. That is what I testified in answer to a question asked me by Miss McHale.

Q. And you became the top ranking officer of all Americans in Spain? A. That is right.

Q. How many Americans were over there? A. Some 3,000 Americans volunteered to fight in Spain.

15161 Q. You were in charge of instruction and training? A. With respect to those Americans. I was in charge of military instruction and training, and I was in charge of political instruction and training in the program of the Spanish Republican Government.

Q. You say the Communist Party in the United States did not send you over there? A. It did not. I volunteered to go over there of my own free will.

Q. But they approved of you going; applauded your going? A. They were very proud of the fact that I went.

Q. And you got your passport in the name of, Israel Regenstreif? A. I got my passport in the name that was on my birth certificate, yes, sir.

Q. It did not list Spain as a place to be visited? A. I did not.

Q. Did you swear to this passport? A. I did.

15162 Q. And you were willing to make a false oath on this passport in order to go over there and fight this rising Fascism in the world? A. I did make some false statements on that passport.

Q. Well, that is why you were doing it, wasn't it? Isn't that what embued you, this desire to fight Fascism? A. I have already testified several times why I went to Spain, and if you want me to I will testify again.

Q. Now, you regard the McCarran Act as a Fascist Act, don't you? A. I certainly do.

Q. Well, wouldn't you give false testimony in this proceeding under the McCarran Act if it would further the

fight on Fascism? A. No, I would not, because it is not necessary.

Q. But you did in this other instance? A. What I did in Spain in connection with my going to Spain, I am proud of.

15167 Q. Weren't you fighting for Communism in Spain? A. No, I wasn't fighting for communism. I was fighting in defense of the Spanish Republican government.

Q. But you admit you were fighting for it in this country? A. Mr. Paisley, everything that I have done, everything that I do in defense of democratic rights, in defense of the economic welfare of the American people, in the defense of peace, is all ultimately in the interests of my ultimate objective of the establishment of socialism; yes.

Q. Isn't socialism a step toward Communism. A. It is the first stage toward Communism.

15170 Q. There are not many people in this communist group who are quite as well educated in it as you are, are there, Mr. Gates? A. You flatter me.

Q. That is right, isn't it, without flattering you or not? A. So what. What is your point? Get to the point.

15181 Q. Well, you were Editor of the Daily Worker when you were on the National Committee of the Communist Party and Chairman of its National Legislative Committee, weren't you? A. That is right.

Q. And you say you are still Editor? A. So far as I know.

Q. And you were Editor even after you were made Chairman of the National Review Commission? A. I have been Editor from July 1947 up until the present time.

15183 Q. Mr. Gates, I show you the Daily Worker for Monday, April 23, 1951, being Petitioner's Exhibit

No. 14. I ask you to look at it. (Document handed to witness.) A. To look at the article, "It Must Be Stopped Now"?

Q. Yes. You were Editor of the Daily Worker at that time, were you? A. Yes.

Q. Did you approve its publication in the paper? A. Well, as Editor of the paper, I am responsible for everything that appears in the paper. I don't necessarily approve every single line or every article that appears, but I am responsible, as Editor, for everything that appears in the paper, yes.

Q. Did you know that that particular advertisement was going to be there? A. I believe so.

Q. What? A. I believe so.

15184 Q. That was the day that the hearings in this case commenced before this Panel, was it not? A. Well, you are a better judge of that than I am. I don't recall. I will take your word for it.

Q. Did you regard that as a day in infamy, and that this was a fake hearing? A. I certainly do and did.

Q. You did and you do? A. That is correct. I think this is a farce.

15189 Q. Physically, where are they, do you know?

A. Mr. Paisley, if you are looking for stoolpigeon testimony, you ought to apply to J. Edgar Hoover. He is the keeper of the rats.

Q. Do you know where they are? A. If I knew, I wouldn't tell you in a million years.

15233 Q. Well, they have an organization they call the Cominform, don't they? A. There is an organization that is called the Communist Information Bureau.



Q. And it is a part of this world Communist movement, is it not? A. In the sense that I have outlined, yes.

Q. The Communist International was at one time, was it not? A. The Communist International was an actual organization of the World Communist movement, and we were affiliated at one time.

15239 Q. Have you ever denounced the Soviet Union in your life? A. Well, I can't recall whether I might have before I joined the Communist movement.

Q. Well, since you joined the Communist movement? A. I certainly have not, because I think in my experience during that period everything that the Soviet Union has done has been for the best interests of its own people and for the best interests of mankind as well.

Q. Not one word denunciatory of the Soviet Union has ever appeared in the Daily Worker or Political Affairs, is that right? A. Not that I can recall, nor do I see why there should be.

15259 Q. Name this Panel one instance when the Daily Worker or Political Affairs has supported the foreign policy of the United States government when it was in opposition to that of the Soviet Union? Give me one instance. A. Well, we have supported the foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration when it was for the friendship and collaboration of the United States and the Soviet Union. This has not been a contradiction to the views of the Soviet Union, I grant you. But why should it be? That was a policy that was in the interests of the American people.

Q. Can you give me one instance of the Daily Worker, either while you were editor or any other time, that has supported this government in opposition to Soviet Union?

A. I can't think of any such instance because of the fact

that it is my opinion that the Soviet Union has never put forward policies which were in any way contrary to the interests of the American people, and our sole standard for judgment in this respect is a particular policy of any government, anywhere in the world, in the interests of the people of the United States of America. If it is, we support it. If it isn't, we oppose it. That is our standard.

Q. Mr. Gates, would such a paper with such an editorial policy, be permitted if the Government which you espouse would come to power in this country? A. Well, I can only answer that the same way as I already answered it, and that is that when socialism is established in the United States of America there will be no need for the type of criticism that the Daily Worker makes at the present time of the capitalist system in the United States.

15277-A Q. Is that the same Gus Hall who was convicted with you? A. That is.

Q. He is the one who signed the answer that was filed to this Board, isn't he? A. I believe so.

Q. Well, is there any doubt in your mind about it? A. No. I just believe so.

Q. You wouldn't dispute that, would you? A. I didn't say I would dispute it.

Q. By the way, where was that answer drafted?

MR. ABT: I object, Mr. Chairman. That is immaterial, where a legal answer to a petition in this proceeding was drafted.

MR. BROWN: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: It was drafted by Mr. Gus Hall.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Did you collaborate in the drafting of the answer?

A. I assisted, yes.

Q. Do you subscribe to everything that is stated in there?  
A. Yes.

Q. Everything that was said about this Board and the McCarran Act? A. Definitely.

15297 Q. Are you sure that copies of For a Lasting Peace weren't received over here by you Communists before they were published? Before November 10, when the first issue came out? A. We received copies of For a Lasting Peace over here before Lasting Peace was published?

Q. Before it was issued to the public. A. Well, I don't believe in the supernatural, but if you do that may have been possible.

MR. BROWN: That is unnecessary.

15298 THE WITNESS: I can only answer a stupid question in such a way.

MR. BROWN: That is not necessary. You are here to answer the questions. Let's not have any observations or comments.

THE WITNESS: We saw no copies of For a Lasting Peace before For a Lasting Peace was published.

MR. BROWN: The question was before it was issued to the public.

THE WITNESS: That is your version. It is the reporters version, too.

15311 Q. Has the Daily Worker or Political Affairs, or has any Communist Party leader in the United States ever denounced or criticized the Cominform or Lasting Peace? A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Well, you would know about it, wouldn't you? A. I have answered not to my knowledge.

Q. Has the Communist Party in the United States or the Daily Worker or Political Affairs ever deviated from the express views and policies of the Cominform? A. Well, I



will answer this question again as I have answered it in the past, and that is that we try in the Communist Party, and this is a separate question and a separate answer, and we try also in the Daily Worker, never to deviate from what we consider to be the true national interests of the American people. We judge everything in the world by that standard. And if we have not expressed any disagreement with any views that have been put forward in For a Lasting  
15312 Peace, that is because we believe that those views have not been in contradiction to the interests of the American people.

Q. Well, a short answer is that you have not deviated, isn't that right? A. No, that may be a short answer but it wouldn't be a truthful answer on my part.

A. The truthful answer is the answer that I have just given.

Q. Give the Panel any instances of deviation. A. I have answered the question.

MR. BROWN: Are there any instances of deviation, Mr. Gates?

THE WITNESS: I said that deviation—

MR. BROWN: I know, but can you answer my question yes or no?

THE WITNESS: The question is a loaded question.

MR. BROWN: It is not a loaded question.

THE WITNESS: You may not think so, but I think so.

MR. BROWN: Well, I think it isn't, because it obviously is not.

THE WITNESS: After all, I am the one who is on the witness stand and not you.

MR. BROWN: And we are trying to get you to act like a witness, which you have not done. The witness is  
15313 here to answer questions and not make observations.

15318 Q. And you said you did know Eisler. A. I said I first met Eisler, and met him several times afterwards, in 1946.

Q. Did you mean to tell the Panel that it was simply by chance that you met this man Eisler early in 1946, when you returned from the army just because you happened to live a few blocks from each other? Was that what you were trying to tell them? A. That is not what I testified to. What I testified to was that Mr. Eisler sent word to me that he wished to see me, if possible, in order to discuss with me my experiences in Germany while I was in Germany as a member of the United States Army. And I accepted his 15319 invitation, I accepted his invitation and since he lived only a few blocks away I visited him in his home, and we did have such a chat.

Q. And you were a member of the National Committee at that time? A. Yes.

15320 Q. Did you publish any of his writings in the Daily Worker? A. I can't exactly recall whether we published—you are specifying of the time that I was editor of the Daily Worker?

Q. Yes.

15321 A. As editor I don't recall whether we actually printed articles written by him and signed by him. I know we carried news stories giving accounts of speeches that he had made at various times during this period. But it may have been that on some occasions we also printed articles by him. I am not certain of it.

Q. Where is he now? A. In Germany.

Q. What is he doing? A. He is, I believe, director of public information in the Government of East Germany, the People's Democratic Republic of Germany.

15325 Q. Is it the custom in the International Communist movement for Communists in one country, when they move to another, to change their membership?

A. I know of no such general custom. It has some-  
 15326 times happened. It all depends. If a man comes here  
 to America and becomes an American citizen and  
 wishes to join the American Communist Party, he is eligi-  
 ble to do so, yes.

Q. Well, did Eisler become a member of the Communist  
 Party of the United States? A. No to my knowledge.

Q. Was he a Communist? A. I believe he was a member  
 of the German Communist Party.

15330 Q. Is the fact that you considered the Soviet  
 Union the leader of the world Communist movement  
 have anything to do with it? A. The fact that we consider  
 the Soviet Union to be the outstanding socialist country of  
 the world, the outstanding force for peace in the world, had  
 a great deal to do with it, yes.

Q. You frequently said that it was the leader of  
 15331 the world Communist movement, haven't you, Mr.  
 Gates? A. We said it was the leader of the world  
 Communist movement in the sense that I have explained it,  
 and the outstanding force for peace—

Q. Let me ask a question. A. Let me answer your ques-  
 tion first, before you ask another question.

Q. I thought you were through. A. Will the stenographer  
 please read back to me where I was, so I can continue my  
 answer?

(The reporter read from his notes as requested)

THE WITNESS: That is all. I have nothing further to say.

Q. Time and time and time again in your writings in the  
 Daily Worker and Political Affairs, you have referred to  
 the Soviet Union as the leader of the world Communist  
 movement, haven't you? A. I have on several occasions, yes.

Q. Did the Daily Worker, to your knowledge, ever deviate  
 in its views and policies from those of the Soviet Union?



15332 THE WITNESS: On the Daily Worker we have always tried, to the best of our ability, never to deviate from what we considered on the Daily Worker to be the true national interests of the American people. That is what we try not to deviate from. Our purpose is never to deviate from anything else. That never occurs to us. Now, whether we have agreed with policies that have been put forward by the Soviet Union from time to time, we have agreed with such policies, yes, because we have considered them to be policies, yes, because we have considered them to be policies in the interest of the American people. But the fact that this takes place within our minds and in our actions has nothing to do with the question of do we deviate from the Soviet Union or from policies of the Soviet Union. That is not our approach to the problem: We don't sit down and say well, this is what the Soviet Union says, now we have to make sure that we must not deviate from what the Soviet Union  
15333 says. That is not the process that takes place in our minds. That is not the way we think, and that is not the way we formulate our policies. The way we formulate our policies is: Is something in the interests of the American people. If it is, we are for it, if it is against it, we are against it.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Then all views and policies of the Soviet Union of which you have any knowledge are in the interests of the American people, right? A. As far as we know, and as far as I have studied them, since they are views and policies which are truly in the interests of their own people, they are also in the interests of our own people.

Q. Has the Daily Worker ever expressed any disagreement with the views and policies of the Soviet Union? A. With the views and policies of the Soviet Union that have had to do with world affairs, particularly to my knowledge we have never expressed any disagreement. On the contrary we have expressed agreement with them because we have felt them to be in the interests of the American people.

Q. And that includes all of those instances in which the views and policies of the Soviet Union are in conflict with those of this government? Right?

. . . . .

15334 THE WITNESS: I am sorry, you are going to have to give me concrete instances of where there are conflicts, where there have been conflicts between a particular administration in this country and views and policies of the Soviet Union. Then I will answer the question as to what our position was on those concrete bases.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. I am asking you, do you know of any instance when there was a conflict, in which the Daily Worker took the side of the United States government? A. As I said, we determine what our position is to policies of a particular administration, that is in power in the United States government, on the basis of whether we consider those policies to be in the interest of the majority of the American people or contrary to the interests of the people.

. . . . .

15355 Q. Did the Communist party have any policy with regard to secrecy of membership?

. . . . .

THE WITNESS: Our policy is that a member of the Communist Party has full authority to decide for himself as to whether or not he or she wants to keep their membership in the Communist Party secret or not secret, and that if a member of the Communist Party feels that it is necessary to keep his or her membership in the Party secret as a means of protecting him or her against illegal or on unconstitutional victimization or persecution, our policy is that they have a perfect right to do so.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. You say that these measures that you took to meet the so-called repressive measures were not voluntary, that they were forced upon you by those people who rule this country, and government? A. Yes.

15356 A. That is correct.

Q. And it was not your choice? A. That is correct.

15375 Q. Isn't it a fact that the Soviet Union is frequently and almost—well, frequently—in literature

15376 that you put out referred to as the fatherland of the world proletariat? A. I don't remember and I don't believe there has been any literature that the Communist Party of the United States has put out in the time that I have been a member of the National Committee that has stated that, although I will say that in previous years there have been occasions when that has been stated, yes.

Q. Well, that has been stated many times, has it not? A. There have been occasions when it has been stated, yes.

Q. You don't repudiate it now, do you? A. I have stated in my testimony here to which country I owe my primary allegiance, the United States of America, and I stand on that testimony.

Q. Do you regard Soviet Russia as the fatherland of the world proletariat or don't you? A. I do not regard the Soviet Union as my country and I do not owe my allegiance to the Soviet Union but to the sovereign power of the majority of the American people.

Q. Will you answer my question? A. I have answered it.

MR. BROWN: You have not answered Mr. Paisley's question, Mr. Witness.

15377 THE WITNESS: Well, you and I, it is not the first time you and I have differed, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: You are not going to lecture me, now.

THE WITNESS: Well, don't lecture me. I have answered it.

MR. BROWN: You have not answered the question.

MR. ABT: We submit that the question has been answered, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWN: Very well, the record will so show, and the record will likewise show that the question was not answered.

THE WITNESS: I am content to rest on the record.

15384 Q. Don't you know as a fact that Earl Browder takes the position that the entire national leadership of Communism had knowledge of, consent and support of all of his policies up to 1945? A. That is Browder's position, yes.

Q. And he stated that in a series of articles answering Gil Green's attack upon him, did he not? A. He stated that in a series of articles that he wrote subsequent to his expulsion from the Communist Party of the United States of America.

Q. Did he not say during the 15 years of the Browder leadership of the Communist Party USA all major policies put into effect had the previous knowledge, consent and active support of the decisive international Communist leadership which thereby fully shared responsibility for those policies, including those of 1944 later challenged? Did he not make that statement?

15385 THE WITNESS: Browder wrote those statements or that statement and these articles that he wrote subsequent to his expulsion from the Communist Party of the United States, and I have expressly denied them in a speech that I made to the 15th National Convention of the Communist Party in 1950.

15394 THE WITNESS: First of all the reference by the question to why did Stalin have over here Commun-



ist International representatives, I deny categorically that Stalin ever had over here Communist International representatives, and I have no knowledge of such.

15429 **Herbert Aptheker** called as a witness by the respondent herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

15430 Q. Will you state your formal education? A. Well, I graduated from the public and high schools in New York, and received a Bachelor of Science at Columbia, a Master of Arts at Columbia, and a Doctor of Philosophy at Columbia.

15431 Q. In what field did you obtain your Ph.D. degree? A. The major was American History; the minor was British History.

15438 Q. What is your present occupation? A. I am continuing as an editor of Masses and Main Stream.

Q. Have you any other occupation? A. Well, I serve also as managing editor, at the moment, of Political Affairs.

Q. Have you published any books, other than the ones you have already mentioned? A. Yes, I have.

Q. What books, and when were they published? A. In terms of books published, that is, written by me and published by others, there are, in addition to those mentioned, a book called Essays and the History of the American Negro, that appeared in 1945. Another book was called "The Negro People in America," which is a critique of Gunnar Myrdal's "An American Dilemma," that appeared in 1946.

In 1948, the book called "To Be Free;" and in 1951, a two-volume work, "The Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States."

Those were the books which I have written so far.

Q. Now, what pamphlets have you written? By the way, on the book entitled, "To Be Free," on what subject was that written? A. It is in the field of American Negro history.

Q. Now, so that we may have for the record, now, who were the publishers of these books? "Essays and History of the American Negro People"? A. That was published by International Publishers.

Q. And "The Negro People of America"? A. International.

Q. And "To Be Free"? A. International.

Q. And "Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States"? A. That is published by Citadel Press, in New York.

Q. Now, you will tell us what pamphlets of yours have been published, and at the same time give us the 15440 publishing house? A. The first pamphlet of mine is called "The Negro in the Civil War." That was published by International Publishers in 1938.

The next was called "Negro Slave Revolts in the United States, 1526 to 1860," the same publisher, in 1939.

That was followed by "The Negro in the American Revolution," the same publisher, in 1940.

Then appeared "The Negro and the Abolitionist Movement," the same publisher, in 1941.

I believe that the next pamphlet, a rather long one, was "Negro Casualties in the Civil War," which was published by the Associated Publishers here in Washington.

That was followed by "The Negro in the Union Navy," in 1946, I think, also Associated Publishers here in Washington.

There are one or two more. One was called "Why Defend the Rights of Communists?" That was published by New Century Publishers in 1949.

Another pamphlet was called "The Schleinger Fraud," a critique of his "Vital Center." That was in 1950.

The last pamphlet was called "America's Racist Laws," 1951, published by Masses and Main Stream.

Q. Do you have now any books in preparation for which publications you have already contracted? A. Yes.

Q. What are they? A. One contracted for is "A 15441 History of the People of the United States." That is due next year, if I can finish it.

Q. Contracted with whom? A. It is contracted with International.

The other is another volume in the "Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States." That is contracted by Citadel.

Another is a book of essays, which is almost done. It is called "After Reconstruction," and it is contracted for with International Publishers.

There are others scheduled, but not contracted for.

Q. Those are books that you are working on but not contracted for? A. That is right.

Q. On what subjects? A. Well, I am working on a collection of my essays in the field of Marxism-Leninism generally, and in the field of current events, which I have published in various publications.

I also was asked by Dr. DuBois to edit his letters, of which there are over 100,000, and I am actively engaged in that, for publication.

15442 Q. Now, I am not going to ask you to name all of your articles, but can you give us an estimate of the number of articles that have been published in various publications? A. Certainly scores; possibly hundreds: I frankly—I have never counted them. Many and many score, let me answer it that way.

Q. Well, will you tell us the names of the publications in which these articles have appeared, not all, but—A. Some of them?

15443 Q. —some of the highlights. A. I have had articles and reviews in *The American Historical Review*; in the *Political Science Quarterly*; in *The American Scholar*; in *The Journal of Negro History*; the *Journal of Negro Education*; in the old *New Masses*; *Political Affairs*; *Masses and Main Stream*; *Main Stream*; *Opportunity*, which is published by the National Urban League; *Phylon*, which is published at Atlanta; *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, which is published by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; and others.

Q. Have you had anything appear in the *American Scholar*? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in *Political Affairs*? A. Yes. I believe I named that.

Q. Now, what has been the field of these articles, in general? A. Well, in general, they have been history, economics, philosophy, sociology, one or two in psychology.

Q. Any dealing with current events? A. Oh, yes, a great many.

Q. Have you written any articles on Marxist-  
15444 Leninist theory? A. Yes, articles specifically devoted to this, many, and most of the articles based upon this science or concept.

Q. Now, will you tell us some of the places where you have been invited to lecture and on what subjects, and where you have lectured? A. I have lectured at dozens of universities in our country. Shall I name some of the universities?

Q. Yes. A. Well, I have lectured at Columbia University; Brooklyn College; Yale; Harvard; at Boston College; University of North Carolina; Wayne; University of Minnesota; of Michigan; San Francisco City College; North Carolina College for Negroes; Benedict College in South Carolina; Allen University in South Carolina; and more.



15446 Q. Have you received any scholarly awards; and if so, what are they? A. I have received some honors of that nature.

Q. Besides the Guggenheim Fellowship. A. Well, for example, I received the History award of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, in 15447 1940. There have been such occasional awards.

Q. Have you been a teacher? A. Yes, I have been a teacher.

Q. Do you now teach? A. Yes, I do.

Q. Where do you now teach? A. I now teach at the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York City.

Q. What is the Jefferson School of Social Science? A. It is a school of adult education with a generally Marxist-Leninist orientation in terms of its faculty and the direction of its teaching.

Q. How long have you been teaching there? A. Since my return, which would be 1946; since 1946.

Q. What courses do you teach there now?

Well, let me put it this way: What courses have you taught there since 1946? A. I have taught the following: History of the American Negro People; History of the United States; A History of the Americas, which was based on Mr. Foster's Outlined Political History—of course, we use many other books; a course on The Philosophy of History, which is an analysis of current philosophies of history, and of historical materialism. There was also a course which

I teach, of a somewhat advanced nature. It is a 15448 seminar course, on ~~Methods of Writing History and~~ Methods of Performing Research in History.

I think that covers what I have taught at the school.

Q. Where else have you taught? A. I have also taught at regular Communist Party schools; National Training Schools, State Training Schools.

Q. And what subjects have you taught there? A. A great many; many of those that I have indicated at the Jefferson School, and particular lectures that I have been invited to give before Party schools on certain aspects of Marxism-

Leninism—the theory<sup>o</sup> of revolution, for instance. I have discussed that several times.

Q. Have your writings and teachings been in any particular recognized school of thought? A. Yes. Ever since I have begun writing, the orientation has been Marxist-Leninist, growingly so, I hope.

Q. Do your writings and teachings reflect the principles of Marxism-Leninism? A. Yes.

Q. Have you studied Marxism-Leninism principles and history? A. Yes, I have.

Q. And in what way have you studied the principles and history of Marxism-Leninism? A. Well,

I devoted my whole life to that. I am not positive when you say “in what way.” I read it, conversed about it, conferred about it, written about it, and lived it. That has been my life.

Q. Well, do you make use of Marxist literature in your work? A. All of the time.

15480 Q. Did Marx and Engels take any steps to obtain adherents to their principles?

15481 A. They helped organize Communist leagues, the international workman's association, clubs. They helped organize Communist clubs in this country in 1857. The first Communist club that was founded was called that, in New York City. This was founded by a man who was a friend of Marx, a Marxist, Weydemyer. . . .

Q. What else was done by Marx and Engels in their relationship to the United States in that period? A. Marx and Engels both had close relationship to the United States throughout their lives. Both wrote for American newspapers. I think I said they corresponded, I said Marx did. Engels did, also, for the New York Tribune. Many of the leading features in the editorial pages of the New

15482 York Tribune in the 1850's were actually written by either Marx or Engels. They also wrote for German language publications in the United States. For example, one of Marx's books, "The 18th Brumaire," first appeared in print in United States. They were, both Marx and Engels, were influential in terms even of the founding of the Republican Party, directly and in terms of Marxists who were here. The Marxists who were here constituted the left wing of the young and virile Republican Party. Marx and Engels were very active, personally and through adherents here in the development of the abolitionist movement. Marx and Engels were very active indeed during the Civil War, and very influential. Let me just briefly indicate that, if I may, in terms of your question.

Marx and Engels were leaders in organizing the European working class and especially the British working class, they were living there, in resisting efforts by the reactionary governments of England and of France, the efforts of those governments to fully support the confederate government. Indeed to the point of open recognition and even war against the United States. The governments were anxious for this on the whole. The working class of England and France resisted this, and indeed said that if England and France went into such a war on the side of the Confederacy it would be unjust because it would favor slavery, and the 15483 working class said that they would not support such a war. There were great strikes, demonstrations, petitions and so on. The historic fact is that Marx and Engels led in the organization of that, through the International Workingmen's Organization, which by the way the United States Government knew and appreciated. Marx corresponded with Lincoln, Marx with Lincoln, Lincoln with Marx. The ambassador of the U. S. in London personally saw Marx and handed him correspondence from Lincoln, personally expressing gratitude on behalf of the sovereignty of our country. This is another typical example of this type of relationship.

Let me if I may mention one more, and these are by no means exhaustive, just to indicate this. As I said, Marx and Engels devoted their lives to working class activity and trade union activity. It is a fact that the trade union movement here grew very much during and after the Civil War, and Marx was especially interested in that and corresponded with the leading American labor figures and trade union figures, especially William H. Sylvius, who was the founder of the National Labor Union in this country. That was the first national federation of trade unions.

Sylvius, as a matter of fact, was moving close to the ideas of Marxism before his early death in 1869.

Now, they corresponded and they correspond especially as to the nature of trade union activity, and such things as the 8-hour demand in the movement. As a matter of fact, there is a reference to that even in Capital, and if I will be permitted to do so, I will just briefly mention it, even in this basic work. It happens to be on page 329. I noted it here where Marx refers to the Civil War in the United States and issues his classical formulation, labor can not emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded, and then he points to the developments of the trade union movement as I have just done, and he specifically mentions with pride the fact that the national labor union convention in Baltimore, in 1866, had a program similar to that of the International Workingmen's Association, which met the same year in Geneva, both of them coming out for an 8-hour day and so on.

Now, this was a reflection of the actual demands of the working class in both countries, but it was also a reflection of the interests of Marx in the United States and actually working together, and as I repeat, they corresponded with the other until Sylvius' death in 1869.

These are some examples. There are others, throughout the lives of Marx and Engels.

Q: Will you tell us something more about the American Marxists of that period? You told us about Weydemeyer.



Did he become a general later? A. He rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the Union Army under Lincoln. He was stationed in St. Louis with General Fremont.

15485 There were others, Jacoby, Sorge, a man named Douai, who was a physician, lived in Texas and other Communists. They called themselves Communists then, a hundred years ago, lived in this country, organized and took prominent part in democratic working class movements, including the formation of the Republican Party.

15491 Q. At the time of the recess, Doctor, we had the following question. I said in their time, that is Marx's and Engels', were there any rival theories which attempted to attract the adherents of the working class, which purported to be in the interests of the working class, and what were those rival theories? To save time, if there were such rival theories, after you tell us what they were, tell us what the controversy was between Marxism and these theories.

A. I would like to mention the names of one or two of the leaders of these movements because they directly impinge on Marxist development. For example, Bakunin, a contemporary of Marx, was an anarchist. Most, also a contemporary, was an anarchist. But Baukunin was a Russian, Most German. Another is Blanqui, a Frenchman. Another is Sorel, also a Frenchman.

Now, these men appear and reappear in Marxist-Leninist literature. The men also appear in terms of the biography of Marx and Engels, that is, they were contemporaries and they were in conflict, organizationally and ideologically.

15493 Now, the fact is that Marxism from its beginning denounced concepts of conspiracy, denounced and bitterly fought, and always has bitterly fought, against concepts of anarchism and against concepts of terrorism. This was

true in the founding of Marxism. It is one of the ways, in fact, that Marxism was founded. It came into being in opposition to such theories. And its history, throughout in every country, not least in our country, has been history of opposition to these concepts.

In terms of your question as to the fundamental reasons for the argument, what they had at issue, the fundamental point is that Marxism, from its beginnings, as is stated in the Communist Manifesto, the Communist movement, says the Manifesto, is the movement of the vast majority in the interests of the vast majority. From its very beginning it has thought of itself as a democratic mass movement. If it is a democratic mass movement, that means that you have to win the consent of the people. It means, therefore, that it not only can't advocate conspiracy, but it must fight against the concept of conspiracy. It means also from the same point of view that it must be opposed to anarchism and to terrorism, because it is a movement which is grounded in mass persuasion, in winning over the mass of the people, to their point of view.

Now, if it is such a movement, obviously terrorism, 15494 anarchism, conspiracy, are not only not part of Marxism, but the point I am trying to get the Panel to see if I can, not only that they are not part of it but that Marxism is organically, philosophically, opposed and must be to concepts of conspiracy, and anarchism, terrorism and so on.

If I may just put my finger on one or two very brief citations to give some idea of this, it will take a minute. But as I say, it recurs throughout Marxist-Leninist literature. Let me give one or two examples.

I remarked that Marx wrote for the Tribune. Here is an article which Marx wrote for the New York Tribune November 25, 1851, and he says: "The times of the superstition which attributed revolution to the will of a few agitators have long passed away. Every one knows nowadays that wherever there is a revolutionary convulsion there must be

some social want in the background which is prevented by outworn institutions from satisfying itself."

Or to take another example. Here is Engels in a letter dated London, April 23, 1885. He is referring to Blanquism. I have already mentioned Louis Blanqui. Blanquism was the concept of the conspiratorial seizure of power by force. Engels' letter, which is quite typical, refers to Blanquism: "The fantasy of overturning an entire society through the action of a small conspiracy." I have one or two 15495 others. For instance, there is a well known classic in Marxist literature by Lenin which is called "What Is To Be Done." It is written in 1902. One of the main points of "What Is To Be Done" is the expression by Lenin in the time of the Czarist tyranny, where there were movements of terror, the expression by Lenin of the typical, well understood, Marxist opposition to terrorism. In this case in Russia it took the form of what was called Nihilism, and as I say, one of the points of Lenin's book, and especially if anyone wants to look at it, page 52 of this book, takes specific opposition to the ideas of terrorism.

15505 Q. Give us a contribution to the science of Marxism and Leninism, by Foster, William Z. Foster. A. Here there have been several. Let's see if I can put this very briefly and in a nutshell. I would say that one of the greatest contributions of William Z. Foster was his genius, which is not asserted only by Communists by any means, his genius in terms of trade union organization, particularly industrial organization. William Z. Foster is an historic name in American history, not only or simply because of his leadership in the Communist movement, but, as I am confident any historian would say of any persuasion, in terms of his help in the development of the American trade union movement. Foster, of course, was the great organizer of the great steel strike of 1919. This is one.

I would say that a second great contribution of Foster, specifically in the United States, was his keen principle of

continuous resistance to any concept of exceptionalism, which has a particular hold, it still has, in the United States. That is, Foster's insistence upon the universality of Marxism-Leninism, upon its full applicability to the United States, the United States is not exceptional, and that Marxism-Leninism applies here as it does to the rest of the world.

He has a genius of persistence, of consistency, in 15506 this, and his concept of class struggle, that this is the core of society, reaches tremendous heights in terms of its devotion and selflessness, and clarity, so that tactically and theoretically Foster's contributions to Marxism-Leninism have been nothing short of remarkable.

One other instance, again as a footnote, his fight, for instance against Keynesism, a leading theoretician of certain approaches to capitalistic economics, a British economist.

15515 Q. Does this mean that Marxism-Leninism does not distinguish between capitalist governments? A. No, on the contrary.

Q. Does it distinguish? A. Yes.

Q. Will you illustrate that? A. Well, Marxism-Leninism is filled, for instance from the very Communist Manifesto up, with great concern for the development of the rights of the people. May I just indicate, for instance: Lenin writes a letter to the American workers, it was published in pamphlet. One of the main points of his letter is to hail the American people, the American working class, because they have an advanced kind of a democratic government, bourgeois but with great democracy, and he refers to the liberating influence of our American revolution and our civil war. In other words, Marxism is partisan from principle to democracy, and the greater the rights of the people, 15516 the more Marxism loves it and fights for it and is devoted to it. So it distinguishes between bourgeois governments.



15537 Q. Now, you have testified concerning these changes in Marxist-Leninist theory as the years have gone by. You have told us of the various changes and given us some illustrations of the various changes.

15538 In teaching Marxism-Leninism do you have occasion to use works which antedate these changes?

A. Yes.

Q. Published works? A. Yes.

Q. Well, why do you use these works that antedate these changes and how do you use them? A. They are used to illuminate the changes. For example, that is if something changes and you want to understand the nature of the change, you want to know what was it that changed. You can't just present somebody with something and say, "This is the change." Anybody with a normal amount of curiosity would say, "Well, what was it before so that I can understand it." This is one very simple usage. The other is historic. You want to have some knowledge of the whole Marxist-Leninist development. That is the very simple reason for using that.

Q. Well, can you tell us what use is made by the Communist Party during your period as a teacher in the Communist schools of the 21 conditions of the Communist International?

A. Purely historic, purely historic, and that is all they are. To indicate this period, very early period—what is it, about 30 years ago or more than that?—of these conditions  
15539 of the International at that time. That is the only use, basically.

Q. And what use has been made and is made by you and other teachers and by members of the Communist Party, leaders, of the Communist Party, of the resolutions of the 6th World Congress of the Communist International? A. They are studied, some elements in them have some applicability, but there has been a 7th—

Q. Seventh what? A. World Congress, and the whole content, the essence of the content of the 6th World Congress is outmoded and is not taught—certainly I never taught it in